

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Held in Washington, D.C., February 20, 1950

The fifth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, during the fiscal year 1950, was held in its Office in the Interior Department Building on Monday, February 20, 1950. The following members were present:

Mr. Clarke, Chairman,
Mr. Finley,
Mr. Reinhard,
Mr. Murphy,
Mr. Lawrie,

also, H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and
Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the Meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on January 6, 1950, were approved.

2. REPORT ON PRINTING SENATE DOCUMENT 128: The Secretary reported that on January 18, 1950, Senator Taft secured the consent of the United States Senate to have printed, with illustrations, his article entitled "Forty Years of Achievement, " commemorating 40 years of service of the Commission of Fine Arts.

The Commission expressed their appreciation of this, and sent a letter to Senator Taft accordingly (Exhibit A).

3. SESQUICENTENNIAL MEETING ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL: The Commission ratified the action taken by the Secretary (with the consent of Mr. Finley) to plan for an evening on the Development of the National Capital, similar to the meeting held in Washington on April 25 and 26, 1929, in bringing this matter before Mr. Edward Boykin, Director of the Sesquicentennial Commission (Exhibit B). Mr. Boykin has approved the scheme and has made \$5,000. available for it, most of which amount to be used in making an up-to-date sound film on the City of Washington, by Dr. Raymond S.

Stites, of the National Gallery of Art. The official meeting would be held on May 17, 1950, in the Department Auditorium on Constitution Avenue near Fourteenth Street, with an "overflow" meeting on May 18th. Preliminary approval to the scheme had been secured by the Secretary from Dean Wurster, Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

The Commission discussed the subject, and decided to plan for a program. Major General U.S. Grant III (Retired) is to be Chairman. Arrangements are being made to secure several distinguished speakers, among them the President of the United States.

4. RAISING DUPONT MEMORIAL FOUNTAIN: In connection with the re-erection of the Dupont Memorial Fountain, on completion of the Dupont Circle Underpass, Mr. Thompson reported that it would be desirable to raise the fountain 1' 0" so as to make the inscription, which is on the rim of the bowl, visible to the public. Chairman Clarke stated that this is a meritorious request, and the Commission ratified the action of the Chairman in approving the change. (Exhibit C)

5. A BILL TO BUY LAND IN SQUARE 167. The Secretary reported that some weeks ago a private builder contemplated buying the old Carnegie Endowment Building at the corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and Jackson Place, and offered to submit a sketch for an office building at the site at this meeting of the Commission. The matter was reported to Mr. Crim, who protested against having an office building built next to the Blair House, and to the Public Buildings Administration, which approved buying the corner building, as did the Bureau of the Budget. The Commission took note of the Bill, which was introduced by Congressman Whittington, Chairman of the House Committee on Public Works, and approved it. (Exhibit D). A copy of the letter was sent to Mr. Crim.

6. L'ENFANT MEMORIAL FOUNTAIN: The Secretary presented a copy of a Bill, to provide for the erection of a fountain to the memory of Pierre Charles L'Enfant in the City of Washington. (Exhibit E)

The Commission discussed the Bill and felt it would be more appropriate to place the fountain at the head of Pennsylvania Avenue, near the Treasury Department, replacing an old temporary war building, and where it would be seen by a far greater number of people than at a site heretofore suggested on the Mall, south of the National Archives Building.

It was decided, however, to take no action in the matter pending enactment of the legislation.

7. DESIGNS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL BUILDINGS: Mr. Merrel A. Coe, Municipal Architect, submitted designs for public school buildings, as follows:

(a) Terrell Junior High School; located at First and Piere Streets, Northwest.

Mr. Coe said as to design it is a duplicate of one approved heretofore, excepting one more story is being added.

The design was inspected. Mr. Murphy said, "You could make the tower more solid." Both Mr. Murphy and Mr. Reinhard suggested that this be done by taking out the glass; windows to be put elsewhere.

The Commission thereupon approved the design, subject to these changes.

(b) River Terrace Elementary School: This is a one-story building to be built at 34th and Dix Streets, N.E. Mr. Coe explained features of the design. After inspection, the Commission approved the design.

(c) Francis Junior High School Addition, 24th and P Streets, N.W.: The Commission inspected the design and approved it.

A report was sent to Mr. Coe (Exhibit F).

6. The Committee has also considered the question of the

of the Committee has also considered the question of the

of the Committee has also considered the question of the

The Committee has also considered the question of the

of the Committee has also considered the question of the

of the Committee has also considered the question of the

of the Committee has also considered the question of the

of the Committee has also considered the question of the

It was decided, however, to have no action in the

enactment of the

7. The Committee has also considered the question of the

of the Committee has also considered the question of the

(e) The Committee has also considered the question of the

of the Committee has also considered the question of the

of the Committee has also considered the question of the

of the Committee has also considered the question of the

of the Committee has also considered the question of the

of the Committee has also considered the question of the

of the Committee has also considered the question of the

(b) The Committee has also considered the question of the

of the Committee has also considered the question of the

of the Committee has also considered the question of the

(c) The Committee has also considered the question of the

of the Committee has also considered the question of the

of the Committee has also considered the question of the

NEW FEDERAL COURT

8. SCULPTURE FOR THE ~~RECONSTRUCTION OFFICE~~ BUILDING: Mr. A.S.

Thorn, Supervising Architect, in company with Mr. C. D. Persina, Chief Designer, of the Public Buildings Administration, and Louis Justement, architect, for the new Federal Court Building, presented photographs of quarter-size models by Sidney Waugh, for the four great lawgivers, as heretofore agreed upon, Hammurabi, Justinian, Solon and Moses.

The Commission inspected them and approved the models on the basis of the photographs submitted. (Exhibit G)

Chairman Clarke stated that it will be necessary to hold a meeting in New York City soon in connection with models for World War II Cemeteries, and that these models could also be inspected then.

9. SCULPTURE FOR THE FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING, NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE: The Commission inspected models by Leo Friedlander, sculptor, submitted by the Public Buildings Administration, for sculpture intended as main entrance panels, entitled "State Pride" and "National Justice."

The Commission inspected the models and approved them (Exhibit G).

10. TOMB OF THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER, WORLD WAR II: The Commission considered the question of design for the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, World War II, with the following members of the Department of Defense:

Brig. Gen. L. H. Renfrow, Assistant to the Secretary of Defense;
Col. E. V. Freeman, Chief, Memorial Division, Office of the A.M.G.;
Colonel R. G. Amlong, Office of the Quartermaster General;
W. D. Montfalcone, Office of the Chief of Engineers,
L. H. Each, Office of the Chief of Engineers.

Chairman Clarke had informed the Commission of a committee meeting that he had been asked to attend at the Pentagon Building, about three weeks ago, at which Brig.Gen. Renfrow brought to the attention of the Committee his

suggestion to have only one sarcophagus, instead of two, to simplify matters in the presentation of wreaths, particularly on Memorial Day and Armistice Day. To have the World War II Unknown placed in a vault under that of World War I would make but minor changes at the east entrance of the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater necessary.

Chairman Clarke reminded the Commission that a "One Tomb" scheme had been mentioned heretofore and more or less favored as being the ideal scheme, but it involved the question of change of inscription and as to whether or not Veterans Organizations of World War I and World War II would agree to it. This problem Gen. Renfrow offered to work out.

Col. Freeman had sent over the model for the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, World War II, which was further considered.

Gen. Renfrow appeared before the Commission in company with the officers above-mentioned to explain, which he did in considerable detail, the scheme he had in mind as above stated; and reported as well that he had a meeting with the "Commanders" of several of the leading Veterans Organizations, who had agreed to the new scheme. A copy of the statement by Gen. Renfrow is attached hereto and is made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit H).

The scheme proposed by Gen. Renfrow was considered to be acceptable by the Commission and they approved it, subject to the submission of detailed drawings (Exhibit H-1).

11. BUST OF SECRETARY FORRESTAL: Mr. Osgood Roberts, of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, in company with Mr. C. D. Persina, Chief Designer of the Public Buildings Administration, presented to the Commission a sketch for the pedestal of the bust of Secretary Forrestal, to be placed at the Mall entrance to the Pentagon Building.

Mr. Persina submitted drawings, and an acceptable design was agreed to.

Considerable attention was given to the question of color of the stone pedestal. Mr. Persina said, "We proposed a number of granites and this is the one the sculptor preferred. He liked the character of that-- a granite from Cold Springs.

Mr. Finley said he preferred a lighter stone. A sample of a (pink) granite that is being used for the Andrew W. Mellon Memorial Fountain was inspected and considered favorably.

In conclusion, Chairman Clarke stated: We have reviewed the submission and it was suggested by Mr. Lawrie that the pedestal for the bust be made integral with the wall, that the inscription on the pedestal be limited to the insignia of the Secretary of National Defense (that insignia may be either on the pedestal or on the marble background), consisting of the eagle surrounded by four stars, that the granite have less black in it and be generally pink in color, that a carefully worded inscription be studied and considered for the background of the bust on the existing marble panel. The bust has not been submitted to the Commission; therefore, it is suggested that a model of the bust be put in place on a wooden pedestal and that the lettering be worked out on paper and put in the background for inspection by the Commission.

12. NEVIUS TRACT: Chairman Clarke reported that, pursuant to the receipt of a letter from Secretary Gray of the Department of the Army, expressing himself as being in favor of adding the Nevius Tract to the Arlington National Cemetery, provided the Department of the Army would not have to pay \$1,600,000 for the 25 acres that are now in possession of the Veterans' Administration, he had sent a letter to the President, asking that the land be transferred to the Department of the Army by Executive Order. (Exhibit I). To that letter the President sent a reply to Chairman Clarke, indicating that he was much interested in the communication (Exhibit I-1).

13. MEMORIAL TO MAHATMA GANDHI: The Secretary brought to the attention of the Commission a report from the National Capital Park and Planning Commission (Exhibit J), suggesting several locations for the proposed memorial to Mahatma Gandhi, but expressing preference for one near the India Embassy near Porter Street and Klinge Road, Northwest, where five acres could be had if 2 acres of India Embassy property were added and also 1.8 acres, which could be purchased for \$17,100.

Mr. Irving C. Root, Superintendent of National Capital Parks, stated that the National Park Service concurs in the report of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. It was noted that there is no suitable 5-acre tract of park land available in the central part of the City of Washington for the proposed memorial.

The Commission, after discussion of the subject, felt that the location suggested near the India Embassy would be eminently appropriate for this Memorial to Mahatma Gandhi, and a letter was sent to Mr. J. J. Singh, President of the India League of America accordingly (Exhibit J-1). A copy of the letter was sent to Congressman Celler.

14. PEDESTAL FOR STATUE OF GENERAL ARTIGAS: The Commission ratified the action of the Chairman in approving the working drawings of the pedestal for the Statue of General Jose Artigas, by Harbeson, Hough, Livingston and Larson, Architects of Philadelphia, which Mr. Harry T. Thompson, Asst. Supt. National Capital Parks, submitted to Mr. Clarke while in his office in New York City a few days ago. (Exhibit K)

15. PARKING PLAN FOR OUT-OF-DOOR AMPHITHEATER: The Commission ratified the action of the Chairman in approving a revised design submitted by Mr. Thompson for parking automobiles at the Out-of-Door Amphitheater, which is being built for the Sesquicentennial Celebration. (Exhibit L)

12. The Commission has received from the Government of India a letter dated 10th March 1947, in which the Government of India has requested the Commission to consider the possibility of a joint Indian-British expedition to the North Pole. The Commission has considered this request and has decided to accept it. It has decided to send a joint expedition to the North Pole, consisting of British and Indian members, to be led by a British officer and an Indian officer. The expedition is to be organized by the British Government and the Indian Government. The Commission has decided to provide the expedition with the necessary equipment and supplies. The expedition is to be organized as soon as possible.

13. The Commission has also received from the Government of India a letter dated 10th March 1947, in which the Government of India has requested the Commission to consider the possibility of a joint Indian-British expedition to the South Pole. The Commission has considered this request and has decided to accept it. It has decided to send a joint expedition to the South Pole, consisting of British and Indian members, to be led by a British officer and an Indian officer. The expedition is to be organized by the British Government and the Indian Government. The Commission has decided to provide the expedition with the necessary equipment and supplies. The expedition is to be organized as soon as possible.

14. The Commission has also received from the Government of India a letter dated 10th March 1947, in which the Government of India has requested the Commission to consider the possibility of a joint Indian-British expedition to the North Pole. The Commission has considered this request and has decided to accept it. It has decided to send a joint expedition to the North Pole, consisting of British and Indian members, to be led by a British officer and an Indian officer. The expedition is to be organized by the British Government and the Indian Government. The Commission has decided to provide the expedition with the necessary equipment and supplies. The expedition is to be organized as soon as possible.

15. The Commission has also received from the Government of India a letter dated 10th March 1947, in which the Government of India has requested the Commission to consider the possibility of a joint Indian-British expedition to the South Pole. The Commission has considered this request and has decided to accept it. It has decided to send a joint expedition to the South Pole, consisting of British and Indian members, to be led by a British officer and an Indian officer. The expedition is to be organized by the British Government and the Indian Government. The Commission has decided to provide the expedition with the necessary equipment and supplies. The expedition is to be organized as soon as possible.

16. The Commission has also received from the Government of India a letter dated 10th March 1947, in which the Government of India has requested the Commission to consider the possibility of a joint Indian-British expedition to the North Pole. The Commission has considered this request and has decided to accept it. It has decided to send a joint expedition to the North Pole, consisting of British and Indian members, to be led by a British officer and an Indian officer. The expedition is to be organized by the British Government and the Indian Government. The Commission has decided to provide the expedition with the necessary equipment and supplies. The expedition is to be organized as soon as possible.

16. REPAVING ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE: Mr. Harry T. Thompson, Asst.

Supt. National Capital Parks, brought up the subject of repaving the Arlington Memorial Bridge to relieve the slippery condition of the existing Durex granite blocks. These have been on the bridge since its opening in 1932. Drippings of oil from automobiles has done much damage and also quite a number of the small blocks have been worn smooth.

Chairman Clarke stated that he has had considerable experience regarding bridge pavements and "no matter what kind of pavement is put on the bridge, it is ultimately going to become slippery. As I wrote to you, it may be that the granite blocks have gotten a film on them that could be cleaned by some method--sandblasting, or something of that sort, but certainly you have a better nonskid surface there than you would have with any bituminous mix, either hot or cold. . . Suppose you had a concrete pavement. ~~Every~~ if you scored it, it would become slippery--and you would not want concrete. . . Every one of those joints was poured individually by a workman with a can. This hot tar was carefully poured while one of your inspectors stood alongside to see that none was poured on the granite."

Mr. Thompson remarked,

"I put up the question to the granite industry and they have come back with the suggestion that these attempts to score it should not be used other than by fire treatment. They think by taking a torch and scoring off the granite surfaces that have become abrasive as a result of the action of the tires and the sand to get rid of the frost, something may be accomplished."

Mr. Finley asked if the autos are going too fast over the bridge.

Mr. Thompson replied, "We have tried to regulate that recently; the flow and the traffic accidents have been reduced considerably. We accomplished that improvement by controlling the speed and the spacing of the cars as they went across."

Chairman Clarke stated, finally, that "This is no place to discuss the technical advantages of one pavement over another." Mr. Thompson remarked that he hoped everyone concerned would cooperate to the end that a satisfactory solution may be reached in this serious problem.

(Exhibit M)

17. SILHOUETTES, ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE: The Commission discussed with Messrs. Fraser and Friedlander, also with Mr. Smith of the firm of McKim, Mead and White, Architects of the Arlington Memorial Bridge, the question of lowering the pedestals of the statuary for the Arlington Memorial Bridge, because, being 16 feet high and to be in bronze, rather than granite as originally intended, and resting on 16 foot pedestals, they would possibly interfere with the view of the Lincoln Memorial in crossing the Memorial Bridge from Virginia.

The silhouettes, set in place by the Office of National Capital Parks, were inspected during the afternoon, and it was decided that no change to lower the pedestals was deemed necessary. Mr. Root was informed accordingly (Exhibit N).

A few matters of detail in the matter of carving on the pedestals is to receive further consideration.

The Commission adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

(b) (5) DPP, (b) (7)(C)

Before the Victoria

(U t i d i n g) v l . i b r . o o s

to receive further consideration.

The Commission determined that the

COPY

February 20, 1950.

Dear Senator Taft:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting today, asked me to convey to you their thanks and appreciation for your kindness in having secured the consent of the United States Senate to have printed, with illustrations, a document entitled "Forty Years of Achievement, " commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the establishment of the National Commission of Fine Arts.

The Commission have noted in the Congressional Record of January 18, 1950, that it is being printed as Senate Document No.128.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Honorable Robert A. Taft,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT A

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington

January 28, 1950.

Mr. Edward Boykin, Director,
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Boykin:

For several months the Commission of Fine Arts has been considering the desirability of having a "Symposium on the Plan of Washington," during this Sesquicentennial year, similar to one held in April, 1929, when the great Public Buildings Program was under way in our National Capital. The matter has been taken up with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and they likewise feel it would be very helpful to the advancement of the Plan of Washington to have such a meeting. Both Commissions feel the "Symposium" should be held under auspices of the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission.

It is planned to have the meeting at the Departmental Auditorium, near Fourteenth Street and Constitution Avenue, Northwest, which holds 1600 people. The dates May 17 and 18 (Wednesday and Thursday) are available, and it is proposed to choose one of those evenings if it does not conflict with an event of your Commission, that has been scheduled.

A very interesting program would be arranged. It is earnestly hoped the President of the United States would be present to make an Address. Members of Congress, as well as officials of the Government generally, would be invited to attend, and several of them would be asked to participate in the program.

Also, it is proposed to having a Moving Picture on the City of Washington, with a historic introduction, followed by pictures of improvements since 1929, and then showing features for the future development of our National Capital. Mr. David Finley, Director of the National Gallery of Art and Vice Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, prepared such a film for the meeting held in 1929, and it was very highly appreciated, so much so that a "crowded house" saw it a second night at the United States Chamber of Commerce Auditorium.

It is proposed to bring Mr. Finley's film up-to-date and make it a sound film. It will cost \$2000 to do this, and we are asking the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to appropriate this amount plus \$500 for incidental expenses, or a total of \$2500. Dr. Raymond S. Stites, Chief Curator of the Research Department of the National Gallery of Art, would supervise the production of the film. The incidental expenses would be for printing invitations, etc.

We hope all this will meet with your approval.

Sincerely yours,

H.P. Caemmerer,
Secretary

EXHIBIT B

COPY

February 9, 1950.

Dear Mr. Thompson:

In reply to your letter of February 3, addressed to Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke, regarding the Dupont Memorial Fountain, I have been requested by Chairman Clarke to advise you that he concurs in your recommendation that, when the Fountain, together with Basin, is again placed at its former site in Dupont Circle, both Fountain and Basin be raised "approximately one foot," keeping the hedge approximately the height shown in the picture submitted.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

H. P. Caemmerer,

Secretary.

Mr. Harry T. Thompson,
Assistant Superintendent,
National Capital Parks,
National Park Service,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT C

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Washington

February 21, 1950.

Dear Mr. Whittington:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 20, 1950, were pleased to consider H.R. 7219, A Bill, "To authorize acquisition by the Administrator of General Services of certain land and the improvements thereon in the District of Columbia.

The land to be acquired is in Square 167, on the west side of Lafayette Park, and, therefore, the Commission of Fine Arts heartily endorse the enactment of this legislation. Recently the Commission have been informed that the erection of an office building at the corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and Jackson Place is being proposed. This would be most unfortunate in view of the close proximity of the site to the White House.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Honorable William M. Whittington, Chairman,
The Committee on Public Works,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT D

THE COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Washington

January 12, 1950

Dear Mr. Washington:

The Commission on the Status of Women, created by Executive Order in 1945, was pleased to receive H. R. 8111, "To amend the legislation by the Administrator of General Services to acquire land and non-ferrous mineral interests in the District of Columbia." The bill is to acquire 10,000 sq. ft. of land and one acre of land, and, therefore, the Commission of the House of Representatives and the Senate, regarding the Commission have been informed that the acquisition of an office building at the corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and Constitution Avenue is being proposed. This would be very important to you as the place proximity of the site to the White House.

For the Commission of the House of Representatives,

Very truly yours,

Elizabeth B. Dole
Chairman

Honorable Elizabeth B. Dole, Washington, D.C.
The Committee on Public Works,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

81ST CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 7219

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 8, 1950

Mr. WHITTINGTON introduced the following bill; which was referred to the
Committee on Public Works

(The Bill has not
as yet been reported
3-21-50)

A BILL

To authorize acquisition by the Administrator of General Services of certain land and the improvements thereon in the District of Columbia.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the Administrator of General Services is hereby au-
4 thorized to acquire by purchase, condemnation, donation,
5 or otherwise, for the construction, enlargement, remodeling,
6 or extension of public buildings in the District of Columbia,
7 at such times and upon such terms and conditions as he
8 deems to be in the best interest of the United States, all
9 privately owned lands or interests in lands, together with
10 the improvements thereon, located within square 167 of
11 the District of Columbia.

81ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 7219

A BILL

To authorize acquisition by the Administrator of General Services of certain land and the improvements thereon in the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WITTINGTON

FEBRUARY 8, 1950

Referred to the Committee on Public Works

1 SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated
2 such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions
3 of section 1 of this Act.

81ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 4274

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 14, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on House Administration

A BILL

Authorizing the erection of a memorial fountain to Pierre Charles L'Enfant in the city of Washington.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby,
4 authorized to secure by competition, according to such regu-
5 lations as he may adopt, designs for a memorial fountain
6 to Pierre Charles L'Enfant, author of the Plan of 1791 for
7 the city of Washington, on a site to be selected jointly by
8 the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and
9 the National Commission of Fine Arts, with the concurrence
10 of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the accepted
11 design shall have the approval of the National Commission

Exhibit E

- 1 of Fine Arts: *Provided further*, That there is hereby author-
- 2 ized to be appropriated such sum as may be necessary
- 3 to carry out such accepted design.

81ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 4274

A BILL

Authorizing the erection of a memorial fountain
to Pierre Charles L'Enfant in the city of
Washington.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee

APRIL 14, 1949

Referred to the Committee on House Administration

COPY

March 2, 1950.

Dear Mr. Coe:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 20, 1950, were pleased to consider designs for public school buildings which you submitted, as follows:

(a) Terrell Junior High School: The Commission approved the design, subject to the suggestion that the windows in the face of the stair tower be removed and a brick wall substituted. The windows should be located on the side of the tower at the stair landing, and at the exit door. The head of the element containing the exit door should be raised up to the top line of the shed over the main entrance.

(b) River Terrace Elementary School: The Commission inspected the design and approved it.

(c) Francis Junior High School: The Commission inspected the design and approved it with the suggestion that the stone base be carried up to the sills of the windows of the first floor and that on the N Street elevation there be four windows the same size, instead of two small ones and one large one.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Mr. M. A. Coe,
Municipal Architect,
District Building,
Washington, D.C.

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman

EXHIBIT F

COPY

March 2, 1950.

Dear Mr. Thorn:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 20th, approved the quarter-scale progress models for the law givers, by Sidney Waugh, sculptor, which you submitted, to be placed in the new Federal Court House. Some time soon the Commission will be pleased to see the models in the studio of Mr. Waugh in New York City.

Also, the Commission approved the models for sculptured panels by Leo Friedlander, sculptor, entitled "State Pride" and "National Justice," for the main entrance of the Federal Office Building, Nashville, Tennessee.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Hon. Allan S. Thorn,
Supervising Architect,
Public Buildings Administration,
General Services,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT G

Tomb of the Unknown Soldier of World War II.

(The following persons joined the meeting:)

Brigadier General L. H. Renfrew, Department of
Defense

Colonel E. V. Freeman, OQMG

Colonel R. G. Amlong, OQMG

N. D. Montfalcone, OCE

L. H. Zach, OCE

CHAIRMAN CLARKE: We will have a report from General Renfrew on the

Tomb of the Unknown Soldier of World War II. I made an informal report to the Commission before the meeting and they know what happened at the meeting, but we do not know what happened subsequently.

GENERAL RENFREW: I am happy to be here today and tell you what has transpired since our last meeting. At that time, we discussed the question of the plan that had been submitted to the Secretary of Defense, indicating that the recommendation of the three Secretaries and the Fine Arts Commission was for two tombs, one to be built in front of the building and between the building and the present tomb, moving the steps and building two sidesteps entering the building on each side with the closing of the windows in the building proper where the memorial effects of the World War I Unknown are now housed.

In a discussion, at that time, the question came up that this had not been in any way discussed with the veterans organizations. The veterans organizations in the United States today number, with their auxiliaries, probably roughly 7 to 9 million members out of the potential 19 million.

We felt that any plan ought at least to be discussed with the heads of those organizations in order that we be sure that, after the plan had been consummated, there would not be violent opposition from the very group for which these tombs were erected as representatives of the men who served at that time.

An alternate plan was proposed not to build a separate tomb, but a new vault beneath the present tomb in which the body of the unknown member of the armed forces of World War II would be interred.

(The following persons joined the meeting)

Brigadier General I. E. Hendrix, President
Detachment
Colonel H. V. Freeman, Staff
Colonel H. G. Smith, Staff
N. D. Montague, Staff
I. H. Smith, Staff

CHAIRMAN: We will have a report from the committee on the

work of the National Council of World War II. I have an important report to

the Commission before the meeting and they have been asked to be ready,

but we do not know what happened in the meeting.

GENERAL HENDRIX: I am happy to be here today and will give you what has

transpired since our last meeting. At that time, we discussed the question

of the plan that had been submitted to the Secretary of Defense, and I think

that the recommendation of the staff committee and the plan that was

as for two terms, one to be held in front of the building and behind the

building and the present term, moving and the new building, the building

entering the building on each side with the plan of the windows in the building.

proper when the National Council of World War II is held in the building.

In a discussion, at that time, the question came up that this had not

been in any way discussed with the various organizations.

organizations in the United States today number, with their committees, possibly

roughly 7 to 8 million members, out of the potential 15 million.

He felt that any plan could be set to be discussed with the

of those organizations in order that we do not have, either the plan that

confronted, there would not be violent opposition from the very group that

these things were needed as representatives of the men who served in World War II.

In alternate plan was proposed not to hold a separate body, but to

and beneath the present term in which the body of the National Council of

armed forces of World War II would be increased.

That was the alternate plan discussed then and we decided to take both plans to the veterans groups. We would present these plans to a meeting of the top representatives of The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars (the Disabled War Veterans were not able to be there that day, but the next day they were informed of it and they concurred), the American Veterans of World War II, the Catholic War Veterans, the Jewish War Veterans, as representatives of the major veterans groups.

I was just telling Mr. Clarke that the National Commander of the Legion, Mr. Gordon Craig, is a veteran of World War II only. When he was told about the meeting, he asked what the purpose was. Without divulging the purpose at all, except to say that it was with regard to the interment of the unknown veteran of World War II, he immediately launched into a long statement as to how he thought it ought to be done and the way he thought it should be handled, which was the method which we discussed and tentatively agreed upon at our meeting prior to that time. So we felt pretty secure as far as the Legion itself was concerned in regard to any plan of this nature.

The reason we had the top men of these organizations in and only the top men and asked that they not take this any farther as far as their organizations were concerned, was that we would not stir up a lot of cause for resolutions and discussion, for, after all, all these resolutions written by the posts or by individuals within the posts are referred in convention to the top men of the organization. If these men were acquainted with the procedures that were to be followed and agreed to them, then we could feel reasonably sure that no resolution would get beyond their particular desk. They would be able to say to the individual or post that they had been informed and were agreeable to any plan that had been agreed to by all concerned.

Knowing veterans organizations as I do, I knew that this procedure would prevent a tremendous upsurge of opposition if the plan was agreeable to those men at the top.

There was also a statement that a certain person had been involved in the

in the plans for the various projects. The person mentioned above was a member

of the organization of the American people, the American people's

movement, and the American people's movement, and the American people's

movement, and the American people's movement, and the American people's

movement, and the American people's movement, and the American people's

movement, and the American people's movement.

I was very happy to see the American people's movement, and the American people's

movement, and the American people's movement, and the American people's

movement, and the American people's movement, and the American people's

movement, and the American people's movement, and the American people's

movement, and the American people's movement, and the American people's

movement, and the American people's movement, and the American people's

movement, and the American people's movement, and the American people's

movement, and the American people's movement, and the American people's

movement, and the American people's movement, and the American people's

movement, and the American people's movement, and the American people's

movement, and the American people's movement, and the American people's

movement, and the American people's movement, and the American people's

movement, and the American people's movement, and the American people's

movement, and the American people's movement, and the American people's

movement, and the American people's movement, and the American people's

movement, and the American people's movement, and the American people's

movement, and the American people's movement, and the American people's

movement, and the American people's movement, and the American people's

movement, and the American people's movement.

movement, and the American people's movement, and the American people's

movement, and the American people's movement, and the American people's

movement, and the American people's movement.

The plan that was suggested was that a shaft be built, a permanent shaft, in front of the present monument or sarcophagus, and the body lowered to a prepared vault beneath the present World War I vault on the day of interment. That meant that the present World War I vault would not be disturbed in any way, that both would be buried under the present sarcophagus erected there.

That necessitated the changing of the wording on the present sacrophagus. The wording on there pertains to an American soldier and does not, in any way, have any connotation except that one person is buried there.

Specifically, each of the veterans organization was polled and asked whether they had any feeling at all about the touching of the wording on the present sacrophagus. They had none. They felt it ought to be changed to conform to the changed procedure. That hurdle was made without any word at all about it. The only indication of any thought regarding this procedure came from the representatives of the American Veterans of World War II, which, of course, is exclusively World War II. There seemed to be just a little feeling on the part of one individual that the burial of one beneath another might not fit entirely with their thinking in the matter. But one of the things that occurred at that point was that one of the officials of the Veterans of Foreign Wars who had three sons in the war, one of whom had been killed in action, said, as a father of a boy who is at present buried in France, he would have no feeling, but he would be highly honored if his boy would be buried in that location had he been one of the unknown.

That seemed to answer all the questions that came up. Nothing else arose. The wording we suggested at that time was presented and we asked if they would go back and think about it and take a week to do that, then, if they had any other wording, that they send that in to us and we would be very happy to consider those.

$\frac{d}{dt} \ln \left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_0} \right) = - \frac{1}{\rho_0} \frac{d\rho}{dt}$

*92010 1202.000

We were not bound to any particular words. As yet no wording has come in. We had a subsequent meeting of the group you attended originally. All have agreed on this plan, if it is agreeable to all concerned. There are several reasons why the other plan did not seem feasible. One had to do with the visit of the President to the tomb twice a year, on November 11th and on May 30th. I have had the experience of twice representing the President on those assignments, when I was at the White House, and the mechanical difficulties of handling those two ceremonies with two tombs placed in any position at that point, made it a very difficult situation for the President to make a decision, first, which tomb he would stand in front of, for he could not stand between them, for he would be standing at the foot of one and at the head of the other; and, second, which wreath he would lay first. It would be necessary for him to lay two instead of one.

His staff generally consists of his military staff and members of his cabinet and sometimes members of the General Staff, the Joint Chiefs and others. The space there, even with the steps removed, was too small to account for any of these things.

The question of a guard came up, whether there should be one guard or two. There is a 24-hour guard there, and it would necessitate having two sets of guards. That would double the present complement of the guard. If you did not have that, then one guard would have to walk in a square formation, which would preclude the public from going in there at all in front of the tombs.

The question of the removal of the steps leading from the building to the present site of the time was another point. That building was never erected for the present purpose for which it is being used. However, the building has been now put to use to hold the honors that have come to the unknown dead who are in that area. Removing the front steps would cut off that building as a

...the were not bound to any particular order. The day no morning, but
...in. He had a consequent feeling of the room was somewhat
...I have some of the plan, it is a question of all together. There is
...several reasons why the other plan was not a good one. The need to do this
...the visit of the President to the town twice a year, or November 15th, when
...day 30th. I have had the experience of twice representing the President in some
...foreigners, then I was at the White House, and the technical difficulties of
...including these two ceremonies with two other placed in any position in the room,
...and it is a very difficult situation for the President to take a decision, first,
...which time he would stand in front of the room and stand between them, for he
...could not stand at the foot of the room as the President of the United States,
...which would be a very bad thing. It would be necessary for him to say that he
...best of all.

His staff generally consists of his military staff and members of his
...advisers and sometimes members of the General Staff, the Joint Chiefs and others.
...the space there, even with the space reserved, and not shall be necessary for any
...of these things.

The question of a guard comes up, whether there should be one guard or
...two. There is a 12-foot guard there, and it would be necessary to have two
...guards. That would double the present complement of the guard. It would be
...to have that, then one guard, only have to walk in a square formation, and
...only the front of the public would go in there. It would be all in front of the house.

The question of the removal of the staff from the building
...to the present site of the staff was another point. That building was never
...intended for the present purpose for which it is being used. However, the building
...has been now put to use to hold the papers that have come to the attention of the
...and in that area. Removing the front steps would not be a bad thing, as

direct connecting link between the two, and it would appear, then, that the building is separate and apart, even with the side entrances, from the sarcophagus of the Unknown. I think it well (and the Chairman has agreed, as we all have) that the side entrances be placed on the building, as recommended by the Commission and the other group, in addition to the front steps, so that there would be access in and out of the building, as well as from the standpoint of art, so that the building will be made a little wider by virtue of the side steps; that the windows be closed to give more room inside the building for additional cases to hold additional honors which will come to this unknown soldier, unknown veteran of World War II.

Those two matters were brought up before the veterans groups and they agreed to both of them. There was no objection to them, the side entrances into the building on both sides and the closing of the windows of the building with the same marble out of which the building is erected.

Today we have with us a suggested plan of building this permanent shaft and let me say this (this was discussed, too): If we should, by any unfortunate circumstance, have a world war III, whatever we get now we should make a preparatory base at least for the burial of a world war III veteran. So you will see in the plans that have tentatively been drawn now that the new recommendations envision the burial of a world war III veteran, and, although we probably will not show it until the final planning so we will not get anybody alarmed about this, the Commission should know that the plan, as it is now detailed, would have a shaft built, so that it can be taken farther down and another vault built in the same area for another body.

Colonel Hall, who is the Executive Officer of the Amphitheater Commission, was not quite satisfied with the wording that we had suggested, because he felt it was a little too broad and not specific enough. This was the simple statement:

...connecting link between the two, and it would seem, that, when the
...is separate and apart, even with the same elements, and the same
...the unknown. I think it will have been between the same, as we all know
...at the side entrance by glass or the window, or something of the kind
...the other group, in addition to the first group, as they were in the
...and out of the building, as well as from the surrounding area, and the
...building will be made a little more of the same, as they were in the
...closed to give more room inside, and the same for additional work to be
...additional rooming which will come to both windows, either, which is
...and War II.

Those two and are were brought up, and the same for the same
...to both of them. There was no objection to the food, and the same for
...building on both sides and the opening in the middle of the building
...to same people out of which and building is central.
Today we have seen a very good plan of the building, and the same for
...let me say this (this was discussed, both). It is a plan of the building
...circumstances, have a word with Mr. [Name], and the same for the same
...operatory was to have the same for the same, and the same for the same
...in the plans that have been made, and the same for the same, and the same for the same
...ons envision the plan of a building, and the same for the same, and the same for the same
...it not show the plan of the building, and the same for the same, and the same for the same
...is, the Commission should know that the plan, as it is now, and the same for the same
...self built, as what it can be done. Another plan of the building, and the same for the same
...the spot for another body.

Colonel Hall, who is the Executive Director of the [Name] Commission,
...is not quite satisfied with the working of the [Name] Commission, and the same for the same
...a little too broad and not specific enough. This was the whole [Name] Commission

"Here rests, in honored glory, a member of the American Armed Forces known only to God."

He felt that might have the connotation of a man who served between wars. So today we might suggest that, in order to tie this down a little closer to the two world wars and probably answer all objections on the part of both world war veterans to any change of wording, if they had any, we say:

"Here rests, in honored glory, members of the American Armed Forces of the World Wars known only to God."

That ties it down to World Wars I and II, and, also, any future wars. We would not find any further change required.

If that wording were acceptable, it would then tie it down to the wars known as World War I and World War II. The word "American" is required by law; the words "Armed Forces" are suggested because in the act it speaks of Armed Forces, and that is an all-inclusive term to include all members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force and Coast Guard--any of the Armed Forces. That is a legal term.

The word on the tomb now is "known but to God." There has always been on the part of veterans organizations two objections to the present wording. One is the word "soldier," because there were Marines who were killed at Chateau Thierry and Belleau Woods in the First and Second Divisions. And there were Navy men who were killed in firing the long guns on the railroad cars. So, although the word "soldier" is generally understood by many to mean any member of the Armed Forces, to the men in uniform the soldier is the fellow in the brown suit and not the fellow in the blue.

"Known only to God" seemed more direct and specific as being unknown, rather than "known but to God," which is

We give you these two, the fourth one or the last one. Those are the two that have been suggested which we feel meet the present situation. Personally, I am more inclined to go along with the last one because I think it does tie down definitely to World Wars I and II and gives the World War II boys an opportunity to feel that his comrade is there, while the other has no connotation at all to World Wars I or II. It is not the intention to put on this tomb the reference to World War I and World War II, but we want to say "of the World Wars," which refers to the only two we have had so far, and I hope those are the only two we will ever have.

That is our present situation. I have nothing further to add to that. I discussed this with Secretary Gray and General Collins prior to making any move in this matter and asked them if they had any pride of authorship or desire to hold to the plan that they had submitted. Neither one of them did have. Both said they were perfectly willing to listen to and go along with any suggestion that met with the approval of you folks and others who are equally interested in this matter.

Of course, the question of building one new sarcophagus for World War II brings up the question: Where would you put World War III, if you had it? We soon would get into quite a dispute over the placing of those. We originally thought that probably it could be handled by moving the present one out of center and equidistant from the side place the two tombs out on the step, but, when we found that the body of the World War I veteran was buried in a vault beneath the sarcophagus and not in it and it would necessitate building a whole new vault and moving the body, we felt, under no circumstances, could that ever be recommended or suggested as a possibility. The moving of the sarcophagus itself would not be difficult, but the actual moving of the body would be resented by all peoples in the country, as disturbing the grave of a man who has been buried there as long as he has.

MR. REINHARD: The inscription is on both ends.

GENERAL RENFROW: Only on one end.

CHAIRMAN CLARKE: There are some wreaths on the side.

I raised the question at the meeting. I like the last one. It is euphonic.

"There's a great deal of difference between the two,"

he said, "but I don't think it is a very great one."

"No, I don't think it is," he said, "but I think it is a very great one."

"There's a great deal of difference between the two,"

he said, "but I don't think it is a very great one."

"No, I don't think it is," he said, "but I think it is a very great one."

"There's a great deal of difference between the two,"

he said, "but I don't think it is a very great one."

"No, I don't think it is," he said, "but I think it is a very great one."

"There's a great deal of difference between the two,"

he said, "but I don't think it is a very great one."

"No, I don't think it is," he said, "but I think it is a very great one."

"There's a great deal of difference between the two,"

he said, "but I don't think it is a very great one."

"No, I don't think it is," he said, "but I think it is a very great one."

"There's a great deal of difference between the two,"

he said, "but I don't think it is a very great one."

"No, I don't think it is," he said, "but I think it is a very great one."

"There's a great deal of difference between the two,"

he said, "but I don't think it is a very great one."

"No, I don't think it is," he said, "but I think it is a very great one."

"There's a great deal of difference between the two,"

he said, "but I don't think it is a very great one."

"No, I don't think it is," he said, "but I think it is a very great one."

"There's a great deal of difference between the two,"

he said, "but I don't think it is a very great one."

"No, I don't think it is," he said, "but I think it is a very great one."

"There's a great deal of difference between the two,"

he said, "but I don't think it is a very great one."

"No, I don't think it is," he said, "but I think it is a very great one."

"There's a great deal of difference between the two,"

I just raised the question of "American Armed Forces." It is the United States of America. You have the United States of Brazil. If you use the words "United States," you would have to use the term "United States of America."

GENERAL RENFROW: The only reason for the word "American" is that in the law it specifically specifies the body should be an American.

CHAIRMAN CLARKE: I do not think anybody would raise the question as to what country is represented.

You do not want us to take any action on that today.

GENERAL RENFROW: That is not a thing that we have to decide at the moment. The one thing we have to decide is whether this plan is agreeable, so that matters can be drawn up.

Let me say to you in addition to this, as long as we were planning, we discussed the selection of the individual, the ceremony pertaining to that and the ceremony that will occur after the selection has been made. It is contemplated now that five bodies will be brought back from the areas all over the world. They will be taken to Constitution Hall in Philadelphia. There they will be recasketed in the Philadelphia Navy Yard and with no identification put in the Hall in Philadelphia. And we are going to have a Congressional Medal of Honor man selected from each service to go there and between themselves select one man who, with the Chief of Chaplains of each of the service and a chaplain representing each denomination--Catholic, Protestant and Jewish--will enter and select the one casket that will then be loaded on a naval vessel and brought down the Potomac to the Gun Factory. (The Medal of Honor men will all be below commissioned grades.) From the Gun Factory it will be transported to the Rotunda of the Capitol, where he will be in state from Sunday noon until Wednesday morning, when the interment will take place on the 30th of May 1951.

Then we will have a state funeral, with a caisson from the Capitol to the cemetery, with all of the ceremony of a state funeral involved in it.

At the Philadelphia selection, however, there will be no public ceremony. No one of the public will be permitted to enter or go into the area of the block in which the building is located. It will be under heavy guard. It will be a simple ceremony privately carried on.

CHAIRMAN CLARKE: That is to select the body out of the group.

GENERAL RENFROW: The other four bodies will be returned to the theaters they came from, two to the European Theater and two to the Pacific Theater. There will only be one Unknown of World War II buried here, and that will be this Unknown.

When the ceremony takes place, the body will be lowered into this shaft and rolled back into another vault and sealed. That would give a very fine ceremony to have it that way, because then you could do all your planning around that.

CHAIRMAN CLARKE: The granite pavement would be put back.

GENERAL RENFROW: That is right.

CHAIRMAN CLARKE: There will be no inscription?

GENERAL RENFROW: No, sir. This does not touch the base.

CHAIRMAN CLARKE: In discussing this question of the change of design with the Commission this morning (I would be glad if any member would interrupt me if I do not state how they felt about it), I think we were unanimous in feeling that this suggestion of having one sarcophagus is superior to having two. The fact is that I do not think there was any different thought in our minds in the beginning, but we were fearful of any change in that inscription or even touching it. Now that you have so successfully worked this out with the veterans organizations, we all feel that it is a much more handsome way to do it, a more dignified way to do it, and the appearance of the thing will be very much better.

One sarcophagus will be superior to two.

We do not know what questions will arise for decision by our successors if we had to put a third one there. That would be very difficult.

I think I can speak for the Commission that that phase of it was cleared with us and with the understanding that we shall say the Office of the Secretary of National Defense has cleared the question with the veterans organizations, so as to permit a change in the inscription of the sarcophagus and the interment, as you recommended in this plan, underneath the body of the soldier of World War I.

Is there anything that you gentlemen want to say?

COLONEL FREEMAN: At the time we were considering the various plans, whether one tomb or two tombs, I know the Commission of Fine Arts was afraid that the veterans would object to touching this tomb at all, that they would consider it desecration. I think General Renfrow has solved that question for us. That was the only thing in your mind. You favored one tomb over two tombs. Since that has been cleared up, I think this will be all right.

CHAIRMAN CLARKE: You have done great service because, from every standpoint it will be much handsomer, and we appreciate your efforts in getting these people lined up so they will go along with this. It is much simpler and handsomer this way.

GENERAL RENFROW: The veterans of World War I, who would have the most to say about it, were faced with two propositions: (1) Allowing this remain where it is and having another one placed some place else, which would divide the honors of the days on which commemorations were made. They were also faced with the situation of having two, three or four, or whatever number of these tombs there will be, which would take away from this tomb its importance.

I know that the veterans of World War I agreed very readily to the change of the inscription and the burial simply because they wanted to hold this tomb as the center tomb for all the honors to be conferred and not permit the World War I man to be shoved, aside, as the new ones come along. I think they felt the problem that would be facing the President when he went out there (and other organizations when they go out there--the Military Order of World War I--and foreign delegations and others) as to which wreath to lay first, and one or the other would feel neglected. In this way, the focus of attention would be on one; it would be for both and everyone would be happy about it. I think that is the one reason they all agreed to the change so readily.

CHAIRMAN CLARKE: There is one detail in connection with the cutting of the new inscription. I note here that you followed a suggestion that I offered at the first meeting. The only thing I could think of was to cut out a piece of the stone and put in a new piece with careful jointing. It is stone; it must be incised.

COLONEL FREEMAN: The sandblasting and taking off of the inscription rather than inserting another one, which would have to be perfect--what would you think of sandblasting the whole thing off and then incising the letters?

MR. LAWRIE: You have to cut off about an inch or more. *reverse*

CHAIRMAN CLARKE: Architecturally you create a deeper *reverse* and you create a panel. When you get through, it ought to have the same appearance it has now, with just the changed lettering. If you do that, it would be as easy to cut off six or eight inches and then put in a stone, but not touching the little ballusters.

COLONEL FREEMAN: You have to get a match of color, also.

CHAIRMAN CLARKE: Then you have a complete panel.

COLONEL FREEMAN: That weighs 65 tons and they had to pour four or five blocks to meet the specifications. That is a very carefully selected block.

the participants will be reported to him. He do not know what questions will arise for which he has not prepared. That would be very difficult. I think I can accept for the Commission that we should be prepared with us and with the understanding that we should be prepared to answer the question of the Commission. I think it is very important, so as to provide a change in the composition of the Commission. I think it is very important, so as to provide a change in the composition of the Commission. I think it is very important, so as to provide a change in the composition of the Commission.

Is there anything else you gentlemen want to say? COLLEGE PRESIDENT: At the time we were considering this question, whether we had two topics, I knew the Commission of the two topics. The veterans would object to having this topic at all, that they would consider it desecration. I think I should mention that I had a question for the Commission. I think it is very important, so as to provide a change in the composition of the Commission. I think it is very important, so as to provide a change in the composition of the Commission. I think it is very important, so as to provide a change in the composition of the Commission.

CHAIRMAN: I have done great service because, from my own point of view, it will be much handover, and we appreciate your efforts in getting things done. I think it is very important, so as to provide a change in the composition of the Commission. I think it is very important, so as to provide a change in the composition of the Commission. I think it is very important, so as to provide a change in the composition of the Commission. I think it is very important, so as to provide a change in the composition of the Commission. I think it is very important, so as to provide a change in the composition of the Commission.

CHAIRMAN: There is one detail in connection with the meeting. I think it is very important, so as to provide a change in the composition of the Commission. I think it is very important, so as to provide a change in the composition of the Commission. I think it is very important, so as to provide a change in the composition of the Commission. I think it is very important, so as to provide a change in the composition of the Commission. I think it is very important, so as to provide a change in the composition of the Commission.

CHAIRMAN: I think it is very important, so as to provide a change in the composition of the Commission. I think it is very important, so as to provide a change in the composition of the Commission. I think it is very important, so as to provide a change in the composition of the Commission. I think it is very important, so as to provide a change in the composition of the Commission. I think it is very important, so as to provide a change in the composition of the Commission.

CHAIRMAN: I think it is very important, so as to provide a change in the composition of the Commission. I think it is very important, so as to provide a change in the composition of the Commission. I think it is very important, so as to provide a change in the composition of the Commission. I think it is very important, so as to provide a change in the composition of the Commission. I think it is very important, so as to provide a change in the composition of the Commission.

By cutting that out and cutting that block and inserting another panel, you could fasten it in.

GENERAL RENFROW: We were contemplating putting a very nice fence around this area while they are digging the shaft, so that the people will be excluded when they are doing this work. Then, while they are doing this, they can do this other at the same time, so, when they uncover the area, the change will have been made to the tomb.

CHAIRMAN CLARKE: When you finish it, I do not think anyone would know the difference except a very few.

MR. ZACH: The sun hits differently on two sides of a rectangular form anyway, and your eye would be fooled even if there were a slight difference.

CHAIRMAN CLARKE: That would be a polished joint. If you sandblast it, your color would be different.

MR. MONTFALCON: Your polishing and finishing would be different.

CHAIRMAN CLARKE: Mr. Lawrie raised the question before of the possibility of having steps going down here so, when the pallbearers carry it down, they can put it in this level.

GENERAL RENFROW: You lower a body into a grave. This takes the place of lowering it into a grave. They will be behind artificial grass and you will be lowering it into the grave and then two pallbearers will roll it back. I think that would be a better way rather than build steps and have the pallbearers carry it down.

CHAIRMAN CLARKE: It would not be very expensive to put veneer granite on it. That would be nicer to put down there than the artificial grass. That looks so cheap.

COLONEL FREEMAN: The artificial grass would be to cover the side of the shaft.

CHAIRMAN CLARKE: I know. Just line it with granite. It will be there forever anyway.

MR. MONTFALCON: You can have removal slabs and waterproofing, so, if you want to go in there, you can get in.

MR. REINHARD: How will the record be kept as to how you will know World War I is World War I and World War II is World War II?

COLONEL FREEMAN: You can put an inscription of the slab down there.

MR. REINHARD: Put an inscription on the slab.

MR. MONTFALCON: That is a good idea.

CHAIRMAN CLARKE: If you could line this wall with granite and put a granite slab in there and put the date on it of World War II and the date when your burial took place, it will be all underground and nobody would see it. These could be concrete beams. Those beams could be removed. They could be set in and have a slab put on top. Then there would be greater dignity to it than this artificial stuff.

GENERAL RENFROW: I made it very plain to the veterans groups and to the press, which has been very interested in this matter, that there was never any question in all the discussion as to cost. It was not a question of finance or of cost. That had nothing to do with the decisions. Cost was never a factor in any planning of this matter.

CHAIRMAN CLARKE: Lee, don't you think that would be all right, that way?

MR. LAWRIE: I think that your suggestion of granite is good, and I think it ought to be beautiful granite, really fine work. I would like to see that an architectural chamber, not just a hole in granite.

COLONEL FREEMAN: What type granite would you suggest?

MR. LAWRIE: I should say a dark granite, black granite. I think that ought to be designed.

MR. MURPHY: I think that there is a Labrador granite that is practically black.

MR. LAWRIE: There is some black granite in South America. That is very beautiful granite.

CHAIRMAN CLARKE: There are some good local granites. You had better stick to the United States.

MR. LAWRIE: That is a point.

CHAIRMAN CLARKE: We all agree (Lee and Andy, don't we) to leaving the front steps on the present building and to the other treatment of the building, much the same as we suggested with the doors at the end and the windows closed and the walls extended to give the building a feeling of greater length and dignity. With but one tomb the need for removing the steps is no longer there and there is no use mutilating the building when you do not have to because that will cause criticism that we are not looking for.

COLONEL AMLONG: There is one other consideration in connection with that, widening of the plaza.

CHAIRMAN CLARKE: If there is no objection on the part of the Commission, we approve this changed scheme, keeping the steps in front of the building.

(General discussion)

(The group left the meeting.)

MR. LAMONT: I think that there is a...
...that is...

MR. LAMONT: There is some place...
...of some...

MR. LAMONT: There are some good...
...the...

MR. LAMONT: That is a point...
...the...

MR. LAMONT: He all...
...the...

MR. LAMONT: The front steps...
...the...

MR. LAMONT: The walls...
...the...

MR. LAMONT: The walls...
...the...

MR. LAMONT: The walls...
...the...

MR. LAMONT: The walls...
...the...

MR. LAMONT: The walls...
...the...

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Washington

February 20, 1950.

Brig. Gen. Louis H. Renfrew
Office of Secretary of Defense
Washington, D. C.

Dear General Renfrew:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting today, were pleased to consider your suggestion to revise the scheme related to the internment of an unknown serviceman, World War II, in Arlington Cemetery. This revised scheme, presented by the Department of the Army through Colonel E. V. Freeman, Chief of the Memorial Division, which contemplated utilizing the existing marble sarcophagus to commemorate the Unknown Soldiers "of the American Armed Forces of World Wars", is approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

The Commission believe that the decision to utilize the tomb erected in honor of the Unknown Soldier, World War I, to honor "Members of the American Armed Forces of the World Wars" is eminently satisfactory. It is our understanding that the several organizations of Veterans, representing both World Wars, approved of this scheme in preference to the original one which provided two tombs.

It is understood that detailed plans for remodeling the building at the east side of the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, as well as those for the Tomb, will be submitted to the Commission for final approval when they are completed.

With regard to the proposed change in the inscription on the Tomb, the Commission favor the following:-

Here Rest in Honored Glory
Members of the American Armed Forces
Of the World Wars
Known only to God

FOR THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke
Chairman

THE COMMISSION OF THE UNITED STATES

Washington

January 20, 1924

Brig. Gen. Louis H. Renshaw
Office of Secretary of Defense
Washington, D. C.

Dear General Renshaw:

The Commission of the United States, at their meeting today, were pleased to consider your suggestion to revise the scheme relating to the interment of an unknown serviceman, World War II, in Arlington Cemetery. This revised scheme, presented by the Department of the Army through Colonel E. V. Freeman, Chief of the Memorial Division, which contemplates utilizing the existing marble sarcophagus to commemorate the Unknown Soldiers of the American Armed Forces of World Wars, is approved by the Commission of the United States.

The Commission believe that the decision to utilize the tomb erected in honor of the Unknown Soldiers, World War I, to honor "Unknown" of the American Armed Forces of the World Wars is eminently satisfactory. It is our understanding that the several organizations of veterans, representing both World Wars, approved this scheme in preference to the original one which provided two tombs.

It is understood that detailed plans for remodeling the building at the east side of the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, as well as those for the Tomb, will be submitted to the Commission for final approval when they are completed.

With regard to the proposed change in the inscription on the Tomb, the Commission favor the following:-

Here Rest in Honored Glory
Members of the American Armed Forces
Of the World Wars
Known only to God

FOR THE COMMISSION OF THE UNITED STATES

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke
Chairman

EX-117-1

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON

January 31, 1950

My dear Mr. President:

On November 17, 1949, I addressed a letter, on behalf of this Commission, to the Secretary of National Defense suggesting that a tract of land, owned by the Government of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration consisting of approximately 25 acres and known as the Nevius Tract, situated in Arlington County, Virginia, be dedicated as an addition to the Arlington National Cemetery. This tract of land west of the Potomac River on the extension of the axis of the Mall is located directly in the view looking westerly toward Virginia from the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial, and the Water Gate. In these special circumstances it is the considered judgment of this Commission that the title to this tract should remain with the Government of the United States in perpetuity in order forever to prevent the erection of apartment houses thereon as was once threatened before the Government, through the Veterans' Administration, purchased this property for a hospital.

It is understood that the hospital project has been abandoned on this site. Therefore the Commission of Fine Arts respectfully suggest that the so-called Nevius Tract be turned over to the Department of the Army for use as a permanent addition to the Arlington National Cemetery. It would be most regrettable if this land should be sold to private owners to exploit and thus forever to destroy the view from the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial, and from other points along the Mall and Constitution Avenue looking toward the west across the Potomac.

The Secretary of the Army, to whom the Secretary of National Defense referred my letter of November 17, 1949, has written to me under date of January 18, 1950 stating: "the Department of the Army has no objection to the Nevius Tract being made a part of the Arlington National Cemetery, provided that the land is transferred to this Department without reimbursement." A copy of the letter from the Secretary of the Army, above referred to, is attached herewith.

EXHIBIT I

In the circumstances it is respectfully suggested that the President consider the transfer, by Executive Order, of the Nevinus Tract from the Veterans' Administration to the Department of the Army for addition to the Arlington National Cemetery.

The Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission over a period of many years have hoped that the means might be found whereby this, the last important key piece of land related to the Central Composition of the Nation's Capital, might be acquired by the Government so that the immediate background of the Mall, looking toward the Virginia Hills, may forever be retained as unspoiled landscape.

Respectfully submitted,

For THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

GILMORE S. CLARKE
CHAIRMAN

The President
The White House
Washington
District of Columbia

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

WASHINGTON, D.C.

January 18, 1950

Honorable Gilmore D. Clarke
Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building

Dear Mr. Clarke:

The Secretary of Defense has referred your letter of November 17, 1949, concerning the Nevius Tract, to me for investigation of the problem posed in the acquisition of the tract and its use for cemeterial purposes.

The Department of the Army has no objection to the Nevius Tract being made an integral part of Arlington National Cemetery, provided that the land is transferred to this Department without reimbursement. However, no authority exists, at present, under which the Nevius Tract can be transferred to the Department of the Army, except by reimbursement of the fair value of the property.

The Department of the Army cannot adequately defend a request before Congress for funds amounting to \$1,600,000, which would provide only the limited number of grave sites which could be made available in this 25-acre plot.

Your interest in this matter is greatly appreciated, and I assure you the Department of the Army will lend its assistance in any legislative action which will add this tract to the Arlington National Cemetery without reimbursement.

Sincerely yours,

/s/

Gordon Gray
Secretary of the Army

COPY

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

February 6, 1950.

Dear Mr. Clarke:

I read your letter of January thirty-first with a great deal of interest and appreciate your bringing the matter to my attention.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN

Honorable Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman,
The Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT I-1

COPY

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Washington

February 17, 1950.

Mr. H. P. Caemmerer,
The Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington 25, D.C.

Subject: Proposed Gandhi Memorial in Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Caemmerer:

In accordance with the request made in your letter of December 21, 1949, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission considered at its meeting on January 25, 1950, the matter of a site for the Mahatma Gandhi Memorial in Washington, D. C., as authorized by Public Law 309, 81st Congress, approved September 28, 1949.

It is apparent from the letter signed by the Assistant to the Attorney General to Congressman Emanuel Celler, a copy of which you attached, that authority for the erection of the memorial extends to the use of such public land as may be designated by the Commission of Fine Arts and approved by the Joint Committee on the Library. This, of course, narrows greatly the selection of a suitable site of as much as five acres in extent. However, there is apparently nothing in the resolution that would require the use of public land if there were substantial reasons for selecting a privately-owned site more fully adapted and worthy of the purpose.

In the original city of Washington there are no unallocated public reservations of sufficient size for this memorial and the Commission would be opposed to the use of any of the park areas in this section of the city. These areas are all at a premium as open spaces, and a dangerous precedent would be established if any one of them were allocated for memorial buildings. In its plans, however, the Commission has recognized the need for additional, centrally located sites for just such purposes as the Gandhi Memorial, as will be noted below. Such sites are not now in public ownership.

If it is assumed that availability of public land is more important than a prime central location, the Commission recommends as site in Barnard Hill Park, near the intersection of Eastern Avenue and Bunker Hill Road, N.E. Here ample land is available without greatly impairing park development and use.

There are three additional sites, partly on park property, which could be supplemented and made adequate by relatively small and inexpensive land acquisitions, as follows:

EXHIBIT J

- (1) Between Klinge Road and Porter Streets, N.W., adjoining the India Embassy.

Here 1.2 acres of park property could be enlarged to the required 5 acres by the addition of 2 acres of the embassy property and the acquisition of 1.8 acres contained in Lot 803, Square 2216, assessed at \$17,100.

- (2) Along the Fort Drive, in the vicinity of Hamilton Street and South Dakota Avenue, N.E.

As only a limited strip of park property could be used, it will be necessary to acquire about 5 acres of Parcel 137/32, assessed at \$11,000.

- (3) Near Fort Totten, adjacent to Fort Totten Drive, between Gallatin and Hamilton Streets, N.E.

Here 1.9 acres of U.S. property is available, which would need to be supplemented by an acquisition of about 3.2 acres from Parcel 124/107 adjoining, assessed at \$8,800.

The general locations of these sites are shown on the enclosed map.

The Commission has directed me to ask the Commission of Fine Arts to urge the India League of America to consider a site in the East Capitol Street area, in accordance with the plan jointly approved some years ago by both the Fine Arts and the Planning Commissions. You will recall that it was for just such purposes as the Gandhi Memorial that the East Capitol Street plan was designed. We mentioned that in our report to the House Committee considering the Gandhi Memorial Bill in 1948. A copy of General Grant's letter, which was also sent to Congressman Celler and to the president of the India League of America, is enclosed. There is also enclosed a small print of the East Capitol Street plan.

The Commission will be glad to advise further with your Commission and with the representatives of the India League of America, if you so desire.

Sincerely yours,

A. E. DEMARAY,

Acting Executive Officer.

Enclosures
JN lc

SECRET

Training Interventions

2000

1970-1971 1972-1973 1974-1975

TO THE

COPY
National Capital Park and Planning Commission
Washington

June 15, 1948.

Hon. C. W. Bishop, Chairman,
Subcommittee of the Committee
on House Administration,
House of Representatives,
Washington 25, D.C.

Subject: H.R.460, Memorial to Gandhi.

My dear Mr. Bishop:

At the request of Congressman Emanuel Celler, I am writing you about House Resolution 460, which provides for a memorial to Gandhi. I have also received a letter from the President of the India League of America outlining this proposal in more detail and similarly requesting that I write you.

Unfortunately, there has not been an opportunity to get this matter before the Commission for any formal action nor to clear a report on this legislation with the Bureau of the Budget. However, in view of Congressman Celler's desire for an early report, I am expressing the following opinions.

We do not know of any site in public ownership which would be of sufficient size and otherwise suitable for construction of a commemorative hall with appropriate landscape surroundings. However, we have provided on our proposed plan for the development of East Capitol Street a number of sites that would be ideally suited for this purpose. They are indicated on the enclosed copy of the Commission's plan for the Central Area. None of these sites is in public ownership and thus provision would have to be made for their acquisition.

As an alternative to this suggestion, there is a site of outstanding prominence adjacent to the Government of India Embassy between Klinge Road and Porter Streets on high ground overlooking Rock Creek Park and clearly visible from the new Klinge Road-Porter Street bridge. While it is not in public ownership, it probably could be acquired at a relatively small cost compared to one in the central area. It is, however, not very accessible for an auditorium seating as many as 500 persons.

There are, of course, other outlying sites which might be considered and I would be glad to discuss these possibilities with you at your convenience. However, it seems to me that a site conceived as a part of the East Capitol Street plan would be ideal as it was just this kind of activity which we had in mind to accommodate when the plan was developed. It would further the expansion of a cultural center eastward from the Library of Congress.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Congressman Celler at his request and also to the President of the India League of America.

Sincerely yours,

U.S. Grant, 3rd,
Major General, U.S.A. Ret.,
Chairman.

Enclosure
cc: Congressman Emanuel Celler,
J.J. Singh, President,
India League of America,
40 East 49th Street,
New York 17, N.Y.

JN:wen

(1) The first of these is the fact that the Indian League of the East is a very young organization, and its members are very young.

There is a serious lack of unity among the members of the Indian League of the East, and this is a very serious matter. It is a very serious matter because it is a very serious matter.

(2) The second of these is the fact that the Indian League of the East is a very young organization, and its members are very young.

It is a very serious matter because it is a very serious matter. It is a very serious matter because it is a very serious matter.

(3) The third of these is the fact that the Indian League of the East is a very young organization, and its members are very young.

There is a serious lack of unity among the members of the Indian League of the East, and this is a very serious matter. It is a very serious matter because it is a very serious matter.

The general situation of these things are as follows:

The Committee has discussed the situation of the Indian League of the East, and it has found that the situation is very serious. It is a very serious matter because it is a very serious matter.

The Committee has discussed the situation of the Indian League of the East, and it has found that the situation is very serious. It is a very serious matter because it is a very serious matter.

Very truly yours,

J. H. HARRIS,

General Secretary.

100
100

COPY
National Capital Park and Planning Commission
Washington

June 15, 1948.

Hon. C. W. Bishop, Chairman,
Subcommittee of the Committee
on House Administration,
House of Representatives,
Washington 25, D.C.

Subject: H.R.460, Memorial to Gandhi.

My dear Mr. Bishop:

At the request of Congressman Emanuel Celler, I am writing you about House Resolution 460, which provides for a memorial to Gandhi. I have also received a letter from the President of the India League of America outlining this proposal in more detail and similarly requesting that I write you.

Unfortunately, there has not been an opportunity to get this matter before the Commission for any formal action nor to clear a report on this legislation with the Bureau of the Budget. However, in view of Congressman Celler's desire for an early report, I am expressing the following opinions.

We do not know of any site in public ownership which would be of sufficient size and otherwise suitable for construction of a commemorative hall with appropriate landscape surroundings. However, we have provided on our proposed plan for the development of East Capitol Street a number of sites that would be ideally suited for this purpose. They are indicated on the enclosed copy of the Commission's plan for the Central Area. None of these sites is in public ownership and thus provision would have to be made for their acquisition.

As an alternative to this suggestion, there is a site of outstanding prominence adjacent to the Government of India Embassy between Klinge Road and Porter Streets on high ground overlooking Rock Creek Park and clearly visible from the new Klinge Road-Porter Street bridge. While it is not in public ownership, it probably could be acquired at a relatively small cost compared to one in the central area. It is, however, not very accessible for an auditorium seating as many as 500 persons.

There are, of course, other outlying sites which might be considered and I would be glad to discuss these possibilities with you at your convenience. However, it seems to me that a site conceived as a part of the East Capitol Street plan would be ideal as it was just this kind of activity which we had in mind to accommodate when the plan was developed. It would further the expansion of a cultural center eastward from the Library of Congress.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Congressman Celler at his request and also to the President of the India League of America.

Sincerely yours,

U.S. Grant, 3rd,
Major General, U.S.A. Ret.,
Chairman.

Enclosure
cc: Congressman Emanuel Celler,
J.J. Singh, President,
India League of America,
40 East 49th Street,
New York 17, N.Y.

JN:wen

Jan 10, 1962

Hon. U.S. House of Representatives
Committee on the District of Columbia
House Administration
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.
Mr. Chairman:

At the request of Congressman Emanuel Celler, I am writing you about
House Resolution 101, which provides for a memorial to Lincoln. I have
also received a letter from the President of the India League of America
this proposal in more detail and I am writing you.

Unfortunately, there has not been an opportunity to put this memorial
the Commission for any formal action nor to discuss it in this Committee
with the Bureau of the House. However, in view of the importance of this
for an early report, I am expressing the following opinions.

We do not know of any site in public ownership which would be of sufficient
size and otherwise suitable for construction of a commemorative hall which
appropriate landscape surroundings. However, we have provided in our proposed
plan for the development of West Potomac a number of sites which would be
ideally suited for this purpose. They are located on the eastern shore of
the Commission's plan for the Central area. Some of these sites are in public
ownership and thus provision would have to be made for their acquisition.

As an alternative to this suggestion, there is a site of outstanding
prominence adjacent to the Government of India Embassy between Lincoln Park and
Porter Square on high ground overlooking both Jackson Park and Lincoln Park
from the new Lincoln Memorial. While it is not in public
ownership, it could be acquired at a relatively small cost compared
to one in the central area. It is, however, not very accessible for an
entrance as well as 300 persons.

There are, of course, other suitable sites which might be considered and I
would be glad to discuss these possibilities with you at your convenience. However,
it seems to me that a site on the east side of the Lincoln Memorial
would be ideal as it is that side of the river which is most in mind to
accommodate when the plan was developed. It would provide the situation of a
cultural center eastward from the Lincoln Memorial.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Congressman Celler at his request.
and also to the President of the India League of America.

Sincerely,
Emanuel Celler

U.S. House of Representatives
Mr. Chairman, U.S. House of Representatives
Washington

Enclosure
cc: Congressman Emanuel Celler
J. Edgar Hoover, President
India League of America
40 East 40th Street
New York 17, N.Y.

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON

February 20, 1950.

Dear Mr. Singh:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting today, considered the question of location of the proposed memorial to Mahatma Gandhi in Washington, D.C., as authorized by Public Law 309, 81st Congress, approved September 28, 1949. The Commission were in communication with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, concerning the project.

The Commission of Fine Arts recommend a location, suggested jointly by the two agencies above referred to, between Klinge Road and Porter Streets, Northwest, adjoining the India Embassy. Here 1.2 acres of public park property could be augmented in size to the desired 5 acres by the addition of 2 acres of Embassy property and the acquisition of 1.8 acres contained in Lot 803, Square 2216, now assessed at \$17,100. The Commission regard this location both suitable and appropriate for this Memorial. The small expenditure involved in order to acquire by purchase a parcel of land privately owned, seems justified in order to provide this centrally located site.

In the Central Area of Washington there is no tract of public land, to the extent of 5 acres, that the Commission of Fine Arts would consider suitable for a Memorial such as you propose.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman

Mr. J. J. Singh, President,
India League of America,
Forty East 49th Street,
New York 17, N.Y.

EXHIBIT J-1

COPY

March 10, 1950.

Dear Mr. Root:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 20, 1950, approved the drawing, which was submitted by your Office, of "Plan and Details," by Harbeson, Hough, Livingston and Larson, architects, of Philadelphia, for the pedestal and location of the statue of General José Artigas, to be erected on Constitution Avenue, between Virginia Avenue and Eighteenth Street, Northwest.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Mr. Irving C. Root, Supt.,
National Capital Parks,
National Park Service,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT K

COPY

March 10, 1950.

Dear Mr. Root:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on
February 20, 1950, approved the drawings submitted by your
Office for---

(a) Parking Lots and Service Road, Sesquicentennial
Amphitheater.

(b) Taxi, Bus, Service and Concession Roads, Sesqui-
centennial Amphitheater.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Mr. Irving C. Root, Supt.,
National Capital Parks,
National Park Service,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT L

COPY

March 14, 1950.

Dear Mr. Thompson:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 20, 1950, were pleased to discuss with you and with Mr. James Kellum Smith, of the firm of McKim, Mead and White, the question of repairing the paving of the Arlington Memorial Bridge, which, after twenty years has become worn in places, as well as slippery.

The Commission are unanimous in their opinion that the Durex granite blocks should not be replaced with any other type of pavement.

The Commission concur in the suggestion to preserve the existing pavement and repair it through the simple process of treating the surface with heat through an acetylene torch, so as to remove surface skin on the blocks, and thereby restoring the natural surface of the granite blocks.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

GILMORE D. CLARKE,

Chairman.

Mr. Harry T. Thompson,
Asst. Superintendent,
National Capital Parks,
National Park Service,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT M

Page 17

17

17

17

17

17

17

17

17

17

17

17

17

COPY

The Commission of Fine Arts

Washington

February 20, 1950.

Dear Mr. Root:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting today, were pleased to inspect the models of statuary by Leo Friedlander, sculptor, for the entrance to the Arlington Memorial Bridge, which were placed on pedestals there to determine whether or not in the opinion of the Commission the proposed bronze equestrians would interfere with the view of the Lincoln Memorial in crossing the bridge from Virginia.

After careful inspection of the silhouettes, the Commission were satisfied that the situation is not of such importance as to require a lowering of the pedestal. In this both Mr. Friedlander and Mr. James E. Fraser, sculptor of the companion figures at the entrance to the Rock Creek Parkway, concurred, as well as Mr. James Kellum Smith, representing the firm of McKim, Mead and White, architects of the Arlington Memorial Bridge. Certain suggestions were made relating to inscriptions on the pedestals, which can be considered further at some future time. For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

EXHIBIT N
Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Mr. Irving C. Root,
Superintendent, National
Capital Parks, National Park Service,
Washington, D.C.

THE
INSTITUTE OF JESUS
AND MARY

1871

The Institute of Jesus and Mary was founded in 1871 by the late Rev. Fr. John Baptist, O.S.A., and the late Rev. Fr. John Baptist, O.S.A., who were both of the Society of Jesus. The Institute was founded in the city of New York, and its purpose was to provide a place where the young men of the Society of Jesus could receive a liberal education, and where they could also receive a religious education. The Institute was founded in the city of New York, and its purpose was to provide a place where the young men of the Society of Jesus could receive a liberal education, and where they could also receive a religious education.

The Institute of Jesus and Mary was founded in 1871 by the late Rev. Fr. John Baptist, O.S.A., and the late Rev. Fr. John Baptist, O.S.A., who were both of the Society of Jesus. The Institute was founded in the city of New York, and its purpose was to provide a place where the young men of the Society of Jesus could receive a liberal education, and where they could also receive a religious education. The Institute was founded in the city of New York, and its purpose was to provide a place where the young men of the Society of Jesus could receive a liberal education, and where they could also receive a religious education.

1871

THE
INSTITUTE OF JESUS
AND MARY